

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,717	11/21/2001	Victor Wiener	101351-21	1000
	7590 10/10/2007 CLENNEN & FISH LLP		EXAMINER	
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD			ELAHEE, MD S	
BOSTON, MA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	10/10/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@nutter.com

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
•		09/990,717	WIENER ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	·	Md S. Elahee	2614		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Au</u>	ugust 2007.			
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 49	53 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
4) 🖾	Claim(s) 40-89 is/are pending in the application	1.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.			
5) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		,		
·	Claim(s) 40-89 is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	•		
Applicati	ion Papers				
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the I	Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents)-(d) or (f).		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		 _		
	application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.		
Attachment		∧ □	(BTO 440)		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da			
3) 🔲 Inforr	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is responsive to an amendment filed 08/03/2007. Claims 40-89 are pending. 1.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/03/2007 remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following:

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102:

Regarding claims 40,41,45,46,56,57,61,69,70,73,77, the applicant argues on pages 12-13 that Sussman employs a conventional switching network (i.e., CCTSN), and not an Internet messaging network, for transmitting the directory information to a subscriber. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. In col.5, lines 50-55, Sussman discloses that a user can access telephone subscribers list in on-line directories. In col.6, lines 56-59, Sussman further discloses that the subscribers lists are downloaded into computer. Therefore, it is clear that Sussman employs an Internet messaging network for transmitting the directory information to a subscriber.

The applicant argues on page 15 that Sussman's method of downloading directory data from the service provider to the subscriber is different. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. The applicant is silent about the different method over Sussman's method. Thus the rejection of the claims in view of Sussman remains.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103:

Regarding claims 40,41,45,46,56,57,61,69,70,73,77, the applicant argues on pages 14-15

that "such a modification would not allow an agent to consider a customer's inquiry off-line and

call back the customer only when the agent can answer the customer's question". Examiner

respectfully disagrees with this argument. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed

invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347,

21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Bateman provides the suggestion that when a

customer selects a "HELP" button, ACD functionality distributes a call corresponding to the

selection to one of a plurality of agents (see col.9, lines 65-67, col.10, lines 1-13, 31-38). Thus

the rejection of the claims in view of Bateman and Sussman remains.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 42-44, 47-49, 74-76 and 80-89 are objected to because of the following

informalities: regarding claim 42, the phrase "A method" in line 1 appears to be "The method".

Claims 43-44, 47-49, 74-76 and 80-89 are objected for the same reasons as discussed above with

respect to claim 42. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 52-55, 58 and 59 are objected to because of the following informalities:

regarding claim 52, the phrase "An interface" in line 1 appears to be "The interface". Claims 53-

55, 58 and 59 are objected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 52. Appropriate correction is required.

- 5. Claims 62-68 are objected to because of the following informalities: regarding claim 62, the phrase "A system" in line 1 appears to be "The system". Claims 63-68 are objected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 62. Appropriate correction is required.
- 6. Claims 71 and 72 are objected to because of the following informalities: regarding claim 71, the phrase "A server" in line 1 appears to be "The server". Claim 72 is objected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 71. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 8. Claims 40,41,45,46,56,57,61,69,70,73,77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Sussman** (US 5,483,586).

As to Claims 40,41,45,46,56,57,69,70, with respect to Figures 1-2, **Sussman** teaches a method of establishing a communications call, including:

enabling an A party to select a B party from a database using an interactive device)

connected to a public network, said public network comprising an Internet messaging network

(Figure 1, 2; Col. 3, lines 66,67, Col. 4, lines 1-6, 60-63, Col. 5, lines 47-55, Col. 6, lines 25-34,

Col. 7, lines 13-17);

utilizing said Internet messaging network to access called address data for said B party

from a public directory of said public network in response to selecting said B party (Col. 5, lines

47-55, Col. 6, lines 25-34);

sending said called address data for said B party and calling address data for the A party to

a connection module of said public network (Col. 5, lines 47-55, Col. 6, lines 25-34); and

establishing a call between said A and B parties over said public network using said

connection module and said called and calling address data (Col. 2, lines 28-30, Col. 5, lines 47-

55).

Claim 61 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 40.

Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1-2, Sussman teaches a system for use in establishing a

communications call, including:

a network controller for receiving said called address data and calling address data

corresponding to the A party and generating, in response thereto, network control signals to

cause said at least one public network to establish a call between said A party and said B party

over said network (Col. 2, lines 28-30, Col. 5, lines 47-55).

Claims 73,77 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 40. Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1-6, Sussman teaches a method of establishing a call between parties, including:

generating a second message in response to said first message, said second message including communication addresses determined on the basis of said identification data by accessing a public directory via said messaging network (Col. 2, lines 28-30, Col. 5, lines 47-55, Col. 6, lines 25-34, Col. 7, lines 13-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all 9. obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 10. (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - Determining the scope and contents of the prior art. 1.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. 3.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness 4. or nonobviousness.
- 11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 40, 41, 42/40,42/41, 43-46, 47/40,47/41,47/45, 47/46, 48,49,56-58, 59/56,59/57, 60,61, 62/60,62/61, 63, 64/60,64/61, 65/60,66/61, 67/60,67/61, 68-71, 72/69,72/70, 73-87, 88/40,88/41,88/45,88/46,88/73, 89/40,89/41,89/45,89/46,89/73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bateman et al.** (US 5,884,032) in view of **Sussman** (US 5,483,586).

As to Claims 40,45-46,50-51,60,70,73,79-87, with respect to Figures 1-3, **Bateman** teaches a method of establishing a communications call, including:

enabling a customer [i.e., an A-party] to select on-line help agent [i.e., a B party] using an interactive device, 4, connected to a public network, 6 and 9, said public network comprising an Internet [i.e., Internet messaging network] (Figure 1 and Col. 6, lines 6-13);

utilizing said Internet messaging network to access web pages [i.e., called address data] for said B party from a public directory, 52, of said public network, 6, in response to selecting said B party (Col. 6, lines 31-45);

sending said called address data for said B party and calling address data for the customer [i.e., an A party] to an ACD-MIS system [i.e., connection module] of said public network (Col. 6, lines 32-41); and

establishing a call between said A and B parties over said public network using said connection module and said called and calling address data (Col. 7, lines 5-13).

Bateman teaches when a customer selects a "HELP" button, ACD functionality distributes a call corresponding to the selection to one of a plurality of agents (col.9, lines 65-67, col.10, lines 1-13, 31-38). However, Bateman does not specifically teach selecting a B party from a database. Sussman teaches selecting a B party from a database (Col. 5, lines 47-55, Col. 6, lines 25-34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bateman to select a B party from a database as taught by Sussman. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to make a search of a directory to get a particular agent who can assist him instead of waiting for a certain period of time in a queue.

Claims 41.61.69 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 40. Furthermore, Bateman teaches a method of establishing a communications call, including:

enabling an A party to select a B party using an interactive device connected to a public network, said public network comprising an Internet messaging network (Figure 1 and Col. 6, lines 6-13);

Page 9

utilizing said Internet messaging network to access called address data for said B party using said interactive device and a search module of said public network and a database of said public network including called address data (Col. 6, lines 31-45);

sending said called address data for said B party and calling address data for the A party to a connection module of said public network (Col. 6, lines 32-41); and

establishing a call between said A and B parties over said public network using said connection module and said called and calling address data (Col. 7, lines 5-13).

As to Claim 42/40, 42/41, **Bateman** teaches a method as claimed in claims 40 or 41, wherein said interactive device is a computer and/or telephony device including a visual display (Figure 1, label 4).

As to Claim 43, **Bateman** teaches a method as claimed in claim 40, wherein said interactive device is associated with said A party (Figure 1).

As to Claim 44, **Bateman** teaches a method as claimed in claim 40, wherein said interactive device is a communications terminal for said call (Col. 7, lines 5-13).

As to Claims 47/45, 47/46, **Bateman** teaches a method as claimed in claims 45 or 46, wherein said public network further comprises at least one public telecommunications network, 9, for connecting said A and B parties (Figure 1).

As to Claim 48, Bateman teaches a method as claimed in claim 47, wherein said messaging network provides said interactive device with a plurality of B party data (Col. 6, lines 32-45).

As to Claim 49, Bateman teaches a method as claimed in claim 47, wherein said messaging network accesses and forwards said called address data to said telecommunications network (Col. 6, lines 31-45).

As to Claims 52,58, Bateman teaches an interface as claimed in claim 51, wherein said results includes called address data for said B party data, and said selected party data includes said called address data (Col. 6, lines 31-41).

As to Claims 53/50,53/51, Bateman teaches an interface as claimed in claims 50, 51 or 52, wherein said interface is sent to said interactive device by said public network on request from said interactive device (Col. 6, lines 1-20).

As to Claims 54-55, Bateman teaches an interface as claimed in claim 51, wherein said public network further comprises at least one public telecommunications network for establishing said call (Figure 1).

As to Claim 56, with respect to Figure 1, Bateman teaches an interface stored on an interactive device connected to a public network, including:

code for generating a display on interactive device of B party data (Col. 6, lines 8-20);

code allowing an A party to select an URL for an available agent (Col. 6, lines 20-30); and code for transmitting to said public network selected party data corresponding to the selected B party and A party data (Col. 6, lines 25-30);

whereby said public network accesses called address data for said B party in a public directory by utilizing an Internet network of said public network on the basis of said selected party data and establishes a call between an A party and a B party using said A party data and said called address data (Col. 6, lines 31-55).

However, Bateman does not specifically teach selecting a B party from said B party data. Sussman teaches selecting a B party from the B party data (Col. 5, lines 47-55, Col. 6, lines 25-34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bateman to select a B party from the B party data as taught by Sussman. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to get a particular agent from a directory who can assist him instead of waiting for a certain period of time in a queue.

Claims 57,77 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 40 and 56. Furthermore, with respect to Figure 1, Bateman teaches an interface stored on an interactive device connected to a public network, including:

code for generating a display on interactive device of B party data (Col. 6, lines 8-20); and

code for transmitting to said public network selected party data corresponding to the selected B party and A party data (Col. 6, lines 25-30);

whereby said public network accesses called address data for said B party in a public directory by utilizing an Internet messaging network of said public network on the basis of said selected party data and establishes a call between an A party and a B party using said A party data and said called address data (Col. 6, lines 31-55).

As to Claims 59/56,59/57, Bateman teaches an interface as claimed in claims 56 or 57, wherein said messaging network of the public network includes a TCP/IP messaging network and said public network further comprises at least one public switched telephone network for establishing said call (Figure 1).

As to Claim 62/61, Bateman teaches a system as claimed in claim 60 or 61, wherein said network includes at least one public telecommunications network, such as a PSTN, for receiving said control signals and establishing said call, and wherein the messaging network comprises the Internet, for passing data between the A party, the access module and the network controller (Figures 1,5).

As to Claim 63, Bateman teaches a system as claimed in claim 61, wherein the access module includes directory data from said directory database for display by said A party (Col. 6, lines 32-41).

As to Claims 64/61, Bateman teaches a system as claimed in claims 60 or 61, including a search module accessible by said A party over said network for searching said directory database (Col. 6, lines 1-5).

As to Claims 65/61, Bateman teaches a system as claimed in claims 60 or 61, wherein said call is established with a terminal of the A party which selects said selected B party (Col. 6, lines 1-5).

As to Claims 66/61, Bateman teaches a system as claimed in claims 60 or 61, wherein said call is established with a terminal of the A party which is separate from the terminal selecting said B party (Figure 1, label 2).

As to Claims 67/61, Bateman teaches a system as claimed in claims 60 or 61, wherein the address data includes a party terminal number and security information (Col. 6, lines 44-50). As to Claim 68, Bateman teaches a system as claimed in claim 60, wherein at least one of the calling address data and the called address data includes account information (Col. 6, lines 63-60 and 6-8).

As to claim 71, Bateman teaches a server as claimed in claim 70, including a directory database module for accessing directory data, including communications address data, of parties connected to at least said public network, wherein the communications address data of said

connect message for at least said B party is obtained using said directory database module (Col. 7, lines 43-61).

Page 14

As to Claims 74,78, Bateman teaches a method as claimed in claim 73, wherein the identification data is page (name data) (Col. 5, lines 15-22).

As to Claim 75, Bateman teaches a method as claimed in claim 73, wherein the directory service is adapted to access a database of URLs (public communications addresses) stored against respective identification data (Col. 5, lines 15-22).

As to Claim 76, Bateman teaches a method as claimed in claim 73, wherein selection of the displayed element invokes generation of code on the interactive device to generate and send the first message (Col. 6, lines 14-24).

As to Claims 88/40,88/41,88/45,88/46,88/73, **Bateman** teaches a network system having components for executing the steps of a method as claimed in claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 73 (Col. 6, lines 31-60).

As to Claims 89/40,89/41,89/45,89/46,89/73, Bateman teaches a Computer software having code for executing the steps of a method as claimed in claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 73 (Col. 6, lines 14-65).

Application/Control Number: 09/990,717

Art Unit: 2614

13. Claims 40,41,45,46,50,51,56,57,60,61,69,70,73,77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Padden et al.** (US 4,979,206) in view of **Sussman** (US 5,483,586).

As to Claims 40,41,45,46,56,57,69,70, with respect to Figures 1-6, **Padden** teaches a method of establishing a communications call, including:

enabling an A party to select a target customer (a B party) from a database using a VRU (an interactive device) connected to a public network, said public network comprising a messaging network (Figure 1 and Col. 6, lines 49-60);

utilizing said messaging network to access called address data for said B party from a public directory of said public network in response to selecting said B party (Col. 6, lines 60-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-7);

sending said called address data for said B party and calling address data for the caller (the A party) to control 10 (a connection module) of said public network (Col. 7, lines 3-15); and

establishing a call between said A and B parties over said public network using said connection module and said called and calling address data (Col. 7, lines 11-14).

Padden discloses voice and data switching network 12 (fig.1) as a messaging network since voice message is being transmitted through the network (see Col. 6, lines 49-60). However, **Padden** does not specifically teach messaging network is an internet messaging network. **Sussman** teaches that messaging network is an internet messaging network (Col. 5, lines 47-55, Col. 6, lines 25-34, 56-59). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Padden** to incorporate messaging network as an internet messaging network as taught by **Sussman**. The motivation for the modification is to

have doing so in order to download subscribers lists to a user device such that the user can

browse through the lists.

Claim 61 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 40.

Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1-6, Padden teaches a system for use in establishing a

communications call, including:

a network controller for receiving said called address data and calling address data

corresponding to the A party and generating, in response thereto, network control signals to

cause said at least one public network to establish a call between said A party and said B party

over said network (Col. 5, lines 50-68).

Claims 73,77 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 40.

Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1-6, Padden teaches a method of establishing a call

between parties, including:

generating a second message in response to said first message, said second message

including communication addresses determined on the basis of said identification data by

accessing a public directory via said messaging network (Col. 5, lines 50-68, Col. 6, lines 60-67

and Col. 7, lines 1-14).

As to Claims 50-51,60 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim

40. Furthermore, with respect to Figures 1-6, Padden teaches an interactive device for

originating a communications call, including:

a display controller for causing display of a desired directory number (at least one B party) (Col. 5, lines 14-18);

an operator (selector) for enabling an A party to select a B party on said display (Col. 5, lines 20-30); and

data link 54 (a link) which on being activated sends selected party data corresponding to said B party to a DAS/C computer (public network),

whereby said public network accesses called address data of said B party in a public directory via a messaging network on the basis of said selected party data and forwards said called address data to connection module of said public network to establish a call with said B party (Col. 5, lines 50-68).

However, **Padden** does not specifically teach displaying of at least one B party from a database to an A party. **Sussman** teaches displaying of at least one B party from a database to an A party (Col. 5, lines 48-55 and Col. 6, lines 26-34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Padden** to display of at least one B party from a database to an A party as taught by **Sussman**. The motivation for the modification is to do so in order to make a selection from a list displayed on his own terminal.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/990,717

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Page 18

supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Md. Shafind Stam Elatice

MD SHAFĬUL ALAM ELAHEE

Examiner

Art Unit 2614

October 1, 2007